

1 **BALABAN & SPIELBERGER, LLP**  
11999 San Vicente Blvd., Suite 345  
2 Los Angeles, CA 90049  
3 Tel: (424) 832-7677  
4 Fax: (424) 832-7702  
5 Daniel K. Balaban, SBN 243652  
6 Andrew J. Spielberger, SBN 120231  
Vanessa L. Loftus-Brewer, SBN 265213

7 **LAW OFFICES OF TERESA LI, PC**  
315 Montgomery Street, 9th Floor  
8 San Francisco, California 94104  
9 Tel: (415) 423-3377  
10 Fax: (888) 646-5493  
Teresa Li, SBN 278779

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
12

13  
14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

16 RUBEN JUAREZ, an individual and  
17 ISELA HERNANDEZ, an individual

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 PRECISION VALVE & AUTOMATION,  
21 Inc., a corporation and DOES 1-20

22 Defendants.

23 Case No.: **2:17-cv-03342**

24  
**OBJECTION TO EVIDENCE  
SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF  
PREVISION VALVE &  
AUTOMATION INC.'S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

25 Date: October 1, 2018

26 Time: 1:30 p.m.

27 Ctrm: 5D, 5th Floor

28 Judge: Hon. Otis D. Wright II

1 Plaintiffs hereby object to the following evidence presented by the moving party  
2 in connection with the motion for summary judgment set for hearing on October 1,  
3 2018 before this Court:

4 (1) Declaration of David Hwang in its entirety.

5 The evidence is objected to on the grounds it is inadmissible as declarant lack  
6 personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702), the declaration lacks foundation (Evid. Code  
7 § 403), violates the best evidence rule (Evid. Code §1520), calls for speculation (Evid.  
8 Code § 702), and is an opinion pursuant to FRE 701 and 702. As such, this declaration  
9 is in violation of FRE 56c(4) and should be excluded in its entirety.

10 (2) Declaration of Lynette Dhillon in its entirety.

11 The evidence is objected to on the grounds it is inadmissible as declarant lack  
12 personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702), the declaration lacks foundation (Evid. Code §  
13 403), violates the best evidence rule (Evid. Code §1520), calls for speculation (Evid.  
14 Code § 702), and is an opinion pursuant to FRE 701 and 702. As such, this declaration  
15 is in violation of FRE 56c(4) and should be excluded in its entirety.

16 (3) Declaration of Duc Q. Phan.

17 The evidence is objected to on the grounds it is inadmissible as declarant lack  
18 personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702), the declaration lacks foundation (Evid. Code  
19 § 403), violates the best evidence rule (Evid. Code §1520), calls for speculation (Evid.  
20 Code § 702), and is an opinion pursuant to FRE 701 and 702. As such, this declaration  
21 is in violation of FRE 56c(4) and should be excluded in its entirety.

22 (4) Declaration of Gregory E. Maxwell

23 The evidence is objected to on the grounds it is inadmissible as declarant lack  
24 personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702), the declaration lacks foundation (Evid. Code  
25 § 403), violates the best evidence rule (Evid. Code §1520), calls for speculation (Evid.

1 Code § 702), and is an opinion pursuant to FRE 701 and 702. As such, this declaration  
2 is in violation of FRE 56c(4) and should be excluded in its entirety.

3 (5) Declaration of Jonathan Urquhart.

4 The evidence is objected to on the grounds it is inadmissible as declarant lack  
5 personal knowledge (Evid. Code § 702) , the declaration lacks foundation (Evid. Code  
6 § 403), violates the best evidence rule (Evid. Code §1520), calls for speculation (Evid.  
7 Code § 702), and is an opinion pursuant to FRE 701 and 702. As such, this declaration  
8 is in violation of FRE 56c(4) and should be excluded in its entirety.

9 (6) Separate Statement Paragraphs 38, 50: Isaac Regev February 3, 2015 Report  
10 including the “History Section” because this is not a narrative of the party.

11 The evidence is objected to on the grounds it calls for speculation (Evid §702),  
12 constitutes inadmissible hearsay (FRE 801, 802), and lacks foundation (FRE 901).

13 (7) Separate Statement Paragraph 39: Dr. Windman’s Report.

14 This statement is vague and ambiguous as to time. The evidence is further  
15 objected to on the grounds it calls for speculation (Evid §702), constitutes inadmissible  
16 hearsay (FRE 801, 802), and lacks foundation (FRE 901).

17 (8) Separate Statement Paragraph 43: “As far as he knew, Space X never  
18 addressed any of his concerns.

19 Objection to the extent this reference is vague, ambiguous, misleading, and calls  
20 for speculation (Evid. § 702).

22 (9) Separate Statement Paragraph 46: “On a medical-intake form, he stated that  
23 he worked with the Arathane and Humiseal products for 4-5 hours every day, which  
24 caused headaches, dizziness, nausea, eye irritation and tiredness.”

25 Objection as this statement is vague and ambiguous as to time.

(10) Separate Statement Paragraph 48: Due to his illness and surgery, Ruben Juarez missed 33.6 weeks of work in 2013 and did not return to work after taking a third medical leave on March 26, 2014.

Objection the declaration Ms. Dhillon is not a doctor and does not have personal knowledge of the reasons Mr. Juarez missed work in 2013.

(11) Separate Statement Paragraph 58: These MSDS sheets were then provided to Ruben Juarez's workers' compensation attorneys.

Objection as this statement is vague as to time and speculative (Evid. § 702).

(12) Separate Statement Paragraph 60: Plaintiffs allege that it was not until then that Juarez “first suspected that the PVA 350 might have caused his injuries.”

Objection vague and ambiguous and thus calls for speculation (Evid. § 702).. as to time including “it” and “then.”

(13) Separate Statement Paragraph 62: The MSDS sheets for all chemicals used in the conformal coating rooms, including Humiseal and Arathane, were accessible on the computer Juarez used at his workstation and in a three-ring binder kept 3-4 feet from the PVA 350.

Objection to the extent the declarants do not have personal knowledge of the alleged facts stated in the declarations.

(14) Separate Statement Paragraph 63: SpaceX complied with its own internal rules which required MSDS sheets to “be readily accessible to employees in their work area during all work shifts.”

Objection to the extent the declarants do not have personal knowledge of the alleged facts stated in the declarations. (Evid. Code § 702)

(15) Separate Statement Paragraph 64: The MSDS sheets were also accessible on at least 14 to 18 different computers located inside and outside the conformal coating rooms where Mr. Juarez worked.

Objection to the extent the declarant do not have personal knowledge of the alleged facts stated in the declarations. (Evid. Code § 702)

(16) Separate Statement Paragraph 65: Juarez consulted the MSDS sheets for Humiseal and Arathane to create experimental and test batches of these materials when SpaceX created the formula it started using in PVA's machine in 2012.

Objection to the extent the declarants do not have personal knowledge of the alleged facts stated in the declarations. (Evid. Code § 702)

(17) Separate Statement Paragraph 65: Juarez consulted the MSDS sheets for Humiseal and Arathane to create experimental and test batches of these materials when SpaceX created the formula it started using in PVA's machine in 2012.

Objection to the extent the declarants do not have personal knowledge of the alleged facts stated in the declarations. (Evid. Code § 702)

(18) Separate Statement Paragraph 77: Plaintiff Juarez asserted legal objections to the above interrogatories based on the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine, but the only evidence withheld on this or any other ground was plaintiffs' attorney's personal "notes from speaking with the clients and witnesses."

Objection as to relevance and call for the attorney client privilege.

(19) Separate Statement Paragraph 80: Other than undisclosed communications with his attorneys, Juarez testified at his deposition that he had no information to explain why he waited until February 27, 2017 to file his lawsuit in this case.

Objection to the extent this called for a legal conclusion and was vague and ambiguous. Further Plaintiffs object to the term “undisclosed” as vague and

1 ambiguous as Juarez has an attorney client privilege not to disclose comments with his  
2 attorney.

3 (20) Plaintiffs object to Exhibit 30 and 41 as Defendant fails to attach the  
4 requisite authentications.  
5

6 Objection. The workers' compensation deposition transcripts cited by the  
7 Defendant do not have the requisite authentications—the court reporter's certification is  
8 missing. (*Orr v. Bank of America*, NT & SA 285 F.3d at 774.). The *Orr* case made it  
9 clear that an attorney cannot authenticate the transcript, even if the attorney attended  
10 the deposition.

11 (21) Plaintiffs object to the Space X documents 66, 67, 68, and 69.

12 Objection. These documents constitute hearsay (FRE 801, 802), no proper  
13 foundations are laid for the business record exceptions or any other exception, and  
14 lacks foundation (FRE 901).

15 (22) Plaintiffs object to the PVA documents relied upon by PVA Inc. including  
16 75-79 .

17 Objection. These documents constitute hearsay (FRE 801, 802), no proper  
18 foundations are laid for the business record exceptions or any other exception, and  
19 lacks foundation (FRE 901).

20 Plaintiffs will respectfully request the court at the hearing on the motion to  
21 sustain the above objections and to strike evidence referred to above.

1  
2 DATED: SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

**BALABAN & SPIELBERGER, LLP**

3  
4 /s/ Vanessa L. Loftus-Brewer  
5 Daniel K. Balaban, Esq.  
6 Andrew J. Spielberger, Esq.  
7 Vanessa L. Loftus-Brewer  
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
BALABAN & SPIELBERGER LLP  
11999 SAN VICENTE BOULEVARD, SUITE 345  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90049